



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,400	10/03/2003	Robert M. Congdon	LOT920030027US1 (012)	3520

46321 7590 10/01/2010  
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP  
STEVEN M. GREENBERG  
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE  
SUITE 2022  
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER
----------

EL CHANTI, HUSSEIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2457

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/01/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* ROBERT M. CONGDON and WEI-LEE H. JAMROG

---

Appeal 2009-006632  
Application 10/678,400  
Technology Center 2400

---

Before KENNETH W. HAIRSTON, JOHN C. MARTIN,  
and THOMAS S. HAHN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HAIRSTON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON REQUEST FOR REHEARING

In a Decision dated May 27, 2010, the Board affirmed the Examiner's anticipation rejection of claims 1 to 14. Appellants have requested a rehearing of our decision to affirm the Examiner's anticipation rejection of claims 1 to 14 (Req. Reh'g. 1, 3).

In the Decision, we determined that Appellants have not demonstrated that the Examiner erred by finding that DeAnna teaches “logical grouping of application server nodes disposed and executing within an application server,” as set forth in claim 1 (Dec. 10).

We have reconsidered our Decision of May 27, 2010, in light of Appellants' comments in the Request, and we find no errors therein. We therefore decline to change our prior decision for at least the following reasons.

In the decision, the Board provided some elucidation of the portions of Appellants' Specification related to the claimed "application server nodes" (Dec. 3-4; FF 1 and 2), as well as the teachings of DeAnna (Dec. 4-5; FF 3 and 4). Based upon the teachings of DeAnna (*see* Dec. 7-9; FF 3 and 4), the Board affirmed the anticipation rejection of all of the claims on appeal.

Appellants do not dispute (*see generally* Req. Reh'g 2-3) any of the factual findings made in our Decision (*see* FF 1-4 at Dec. 3-5). Instead, Appellants contend (Req. Reh'g. 2) that "the Board has determined the meaning of 'application server nodes' to be ambiguous and thus inclusive of 'application operating on a server.'" We disagree. In light of Appellants' originally filed Specification and claims, we found the meaning of "application server nodes" to be broad, not necessarily ambiguous (*see* Dec. 7-9).

Although Appellants admit that they "have not claimed 'application server nodes, each of the nodes hosting execution of an application server, each application server hosting an API [application program interface] to expose business logic and business processes for use by other applications'" (Req. Reh'g 3), Appellants contend that "the plain claim language of 'application server nodes' provides a specific meaning that distinguishes past the basic concept of an application executing in a server" (Req. Reh'g.

3). Appellants contend that “the evidence of record demonstrates the industrially understood meaning of ‘application server’” [is][sic] a ‘server that hosts an API to expose Business Logic and Business Processes for use by other applications’” (Req. Reh’g. 2-3); however, Appellants notably do not contend that the term “application server nodes” is defined in the originally filed Specification and claims.

Our review of the Specification (*see* FF 1 and 2 citing Spec. 5:16-19 and 9:11-17, portions of the Specification describing “application server nodes” and “enterprise beans” that are disposed in the application server 100) does not persuade us that our construction of the term “application server nodes” is in error. Appellants’ arguments in the Request are unpersuasive in view of the Examiner’s findings (Ans. 3 and 6-8), our findings (Dec. 3-5; FF 1-4), and our discussion *supra*, with respect to Appellants’ disclosure in the Specification concerning “application server nodes” and the applications located within the ZDF server 50 of DeAnna.

In our Decision of May 27, 2010, we explained our interpretation of the term “application server nodes” as follows:

Claim 1 merely requires a plurality of “application server nodes” (*see* claim 1). The broadest reasonable interpretation of the phrase “application server node” indicates that points in a network topology or links/interface points such as 171, 172, and 174 shown in DeAnna’s Figure 4 function as recited in the claims (e.g., being disposed and executing within an application server such as ZDF server 50) and would be encompassed by the language of the claims. *See Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d at 1364.

(Dec. 7-8). We also explained why our interpretation is not precluded by the Specification, as follows:

A proper interpretation of claim 1, giving this claim its broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the Specification as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art (*Phillips*, 415 F.3d at 1315) must be construed to be consistent with any definition provided in the originally filed Specification. The Specification (Spec. 5:16-19, 9:11-17; *see* FF 1, 2), however, does not provide any definition for “application server nodes.” In fact, the Specification at page 9 *supports* the Examiner’s position, considering that (i) the Specification describes an application server 100 that has enterprise beans disposed thereon (*see* Spec. 9:13-15), and (ii) DeAnna also has session beans or applications such as timer 171, receiverMDB 172 (message driven bean), and mailprocessorMDB 174 (message driven bean) (FF 3; *see* col. 15, ll. 16, 37, and 55).

Because (i) DeAnna teaches an IMAP compliant mail server coupled to a plurality of applications or session beans disposed in and operating on a ZDF server, and (ii) one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that an application or session bean (e.g., applications 171, 172, and 174) operating on an application server (e.g., ZDF server 50) can be considered an *application server node*, DeAnna necessarily functions in accordance with, or includes, the claimed limitation of “a logical grouping of application server nodes” in an “application server.” Appellants’ originally filed Specification and claims do not preclude such a broad, but reasonable, interpretation of the term “application server nodes.”

(Dec. 8-9).

We have carefully considered the arguments as to claim 1 raised by Appellants in the Request for Rehearing, but none of these arguments is persuasive that the original decision was in error. We find that Appellants have not shown the Board erred in finding that DeAnna teaches “a logical grouping of application server nodes disposed and executing within an

application server” in sustaining the rejection of claims 1 to 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Although the heading on page 2 of the Request for Rehearing implies that Appellants request rehearing of the rejection of claims 2 to 14, we note that Appellants do not provide any separate arguments on the merits as to claims 2 to 8 which depend from claim 1, or as to independent claim 9 and its dependent claims 10 to 14. Based on (i) the content of Appellants’ Request for Rehearing, which only discusses claim 1 on the merits, (ii) the fact that the term in question (“application server nodes”) does not appear in claim 9, and (iii) Appellants’ failure to dispute our conclusion that claims 2 to 14 stand or fall with claim 1 (*see* Dec. 6), we only reconsider our decision with respect to claim 1.

In summary, Appellants’ Request for Rehearing has been granted to the extent that our Decision has been reconsidered, but such request is denied with respect to making any modifications to the decision.

REHEARING  
DENIED

KIS

CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP  
STEVEN M. GREENBERG  
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE  
SUITE 2022  
BOCA RATON FL 33487